

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/070,037

**Applicant(s)**

CHIA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Katherine W. Mitchell

**Art Unit**

3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.

(3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Allesandro Steinf.

(4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 October 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 143.


Identification of prior art discussed: no.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**Katherine Mitchell**  
**Primary Examiner**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner called as "plate-shaped" objection was not addressed. However, examiner has consulted other examiners who agree that, in light of the spec, "plate-shaped" can be understood as --substantially planar--, and thus no amendment to change this is required. Mr. Steinfel agreed to this clarification on the record. Note that "substantially planar" can include a faceted top surface and flat bottom surface.

The reasons for allowance are in the final office action, which indicated claims 143-144 to have allowable subject matter.

A subsequent call was made for examiner's amendment to specification - priority claims in 1st paragraph of specification must match priority on bib data sheet. Bib data sheet is missing that PCT us00/18389 is a CIP of US 09/224936, 12/31/1998, now abandoned, which examiner can and will write in on bib data sheet. (see office action 5/16/2005). However, the 1st paragraph of specification does not list that PCT us00/18389 is a CIP of US 29/098058 12/21/1998, now USPat D 418445.

Examiner faxing both 1st page and bib data sheet (marked up) to applicant at 323-934-0202. Applicant to review and ensure all are correct, and send examiner an email at KATHERINE.MITCHELL@USPTO.GOV with a new first paragraph of specification with all priority claims and their updated patent, not application, numbers (if issued). Examiner will copy this to an examiner's amendment to update the specification, and there will be a 1 month extension of time fee.